

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 16-19 and 21-28 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. All of the claims were rejected. Claims 1-12, 16-19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, because the Patent Office states that in regards to Claim 1: (1) the term “interdependencies between said stored maps and interdependencies between submapss of stored maps” is not clear, (2) it is not clear whether “tolerance map” refers to accumulation maps, or functional maps, or both. Dependent Claims 2-12, 16-19, 21-23 and 25-28 were rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN. 5,586,052 to Iannuzzi et al. (hereinafter “Iannuzzi”). Claims 24-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatenable over commercial software in view of Maxey (AutoCAD).

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for pointing out patentable material in Claims 2-12, 16-19, 21-23 and 25-28 which will be reconsidered if rewritten in definite form.

Claims 1 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice. Though Applicant refutes the Examiner’s reasons for rejections of the claims, Claims 2-12, 16, 21-23, 25 and 26 have been written in independent form including the limitations of Claim 1, and further to include language to clarify that submaps correspond to subzones of tolerance zones. Regarding “tolerance maps”, “accumulations maps” and “functional maps”, it is respectfully submitted that in the Reply to the Office Action of Oct. 27, 2003 (paragraph spanning pages 13 and 14), it was stated that both functional maps and accumulation maps are tolerance maps in which the tolerances are selected such that any accumulation map is inside its corresponding functional map. As such, “tolerance map” refers to both accumulation maps and functional maps as defined.

The amendments to the claims are to place the claims in better condition for allowance under 37 CFR § 1.116. No new matter has been added. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 2-12, 16-19, 21-23 and 25-28 under 35 USC § 112 should be withdrawn in light of the amendments and in light of definitions in the specification as summarized above and in the Reply to the Office Action of Oct. 27, 2003. Further, though Applicant refutes the Examiner's reasons for rejections of the claims, Claims 2-12, 16, 21-23, 25 and 26 have been written in independent form including the limitations of Claim 1, and as such are allowable.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, and other reasons as may be recognized by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that rejection of the claims should be withdrawn. Reexamination, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

April 23, 2004

by Nancy McElrath

Nancy V. McElrath 4-23-04
Signature

April 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Vic Lin

Vic Lin, Esq.

Registration No. 43,754

Myers Dawes Andras & Sherman LLP

19900 MacArthur Boulevard, 11th Floor

Irvine, CA 92612

(949) 223-9600